UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,892	09/17/2003	Hong-Yi Hubert Chen	MP0393	9088

26703   7590   08/15/2008
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE P.L.C.
5445 CORPORATE DRIVE
SUITE 200
TROY, MI 48098

EXAMINER
PATEL, HETUL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2186	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 January 2008</u>.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-23,25,26 and 51-79* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-23,25,26 and 51-79* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/10/2008</u>.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment, petition and IDS filed on

10/04/2007, 01/09/2008 and 03/10/2008, respectively. These responses are carefully

considered. Claims 1-10, 12-23, 25-26 and 51-79 are currently pending in this

application.

2.   The supplemental petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and (a)(6) filed on

01/09/2008 is granted. Hence, the effective filing date of the current application is May

7, 2003.

3.   All previously outstanding objections and rejections to the Applicant's disclosure

and/or claims not contained in this Action have been respectfully withdrawn by the

Examiner hereto.

Information Disclosure Statement

4.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/10/2008 is in

compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure

statement has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-10, 14-23, 51-56, 60-69 and 73-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Jaggar (USPN: 5,701,493) in view of Miller et al. (USPN:

5,809,528) hereinafter, Miller.

As per claim 1, Jaggar teaches a register file for a data processing system

comprising a unbanked memory unit (i.e. the stack memory area) having a plurality of

memory locations, each memory location being addressable by an encoded address

(i.e. the combination of register address and the mode bits, 17 in Figs. 1 and 8), wherein

the encoded address corresponds to at least one register (i.e. registers R0-R13 in Figs.

1 and 8) and processor mode (i.e. a user mode and system mode); input ports (i.e. the

input from the read buffer 8 and the input from the internal bus 4 in Figs. 1 and 8) to

receive inputs for addressing at least one of the memory locations using an encoded

address; and output ports (i.e. the output to write buffer 10 and the output to the internal

bus 4 in Figs. 1 and 8) to output data from at least one of the memory locations

addressable by an encoded address (e.g. see the abstract and Figs. 1 and 8). Jaggar

further teaches an (common) address encoder (i.e. the combination of components 12-

20 in Fig. 8) for all input ports, the address encoder to provide an encoded address (i.e.

the combination of register address and the mode bits, 17 in Fig. 8) for accessing one of

the plurality of registers (i.e. R0-R15 in Fig. 8) (e.g. see Fig. 8).

However, Jaggar does not teach about having a plurality of encoders, a

respective one of them for each of the input ports as claimed. Miller, on the other hand,

teaches about having N address encoders one for each input (see Col. 6, lines 23-35).

Miller also shows a plurality of address encoders (i.e. 102 in Fig. 2A) connected to input

ports of the memory unit (i.e. 110 in Fig. 2A). Accordingly, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of the current invention was made to have

a separate address encoder for each of the input port in the register file of Jaggar as

taught by Miller. In doing so, it increases the overall performance of the data

processing system by providing the encoded addresses for all inputs in parallel

compared to one by one. Therefore, it is being advantageous.

As per claim 2, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed

invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that a plurality of

registers (i.e. registers R0-R13 in Figs. 1 and 8) correspond to the plurality of memory

locations of the unbanked memory unit, i.e. each register corresponds to one or more

memory locations depending on the processor mode (e.g. see the abstract).

As per claim 3, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed

invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that each register (i.e.

registers R0-R13 in Figs. 1 and 8) is addressable by a corresponding encoded address

(i.e. the combination of register address and the mode bits, 17 in Figs. 1 and 8) (e.g.

see the abstract and Figs. 1 and 8).

As per claim 4, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed

invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that at least two

registers are capable of being accessed in different processor modes using the same

encoded address, i.e. the system mode re-uses the same set of registers as the user

mode (e.g. see the abstract).

As per claim 5, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that the read and write requests need to be redirected whenever the mode is changed, therefore, the plurality of memory locations of the stack memory are discontinuous (e.g. see Col. 6, lines 51-61).

As per claim 6, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that a bit width of the plurality of memory locations (i.e. the stackable memory area) is scalable to any arbitrary bit width size (e.g. see Col. 6, lines 51-61).

As per claim 7, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that inputs (i.e. the input from the read buffer 8 and the input from the internal bus 4 in Figs. 1 and 8) are received associated with at least one register (i.e. "reg add" in Fig. 8) and processor mode (i.e. "mode bits" in Fig. 8), and wherein at least one of the outputs (i.e. output in Fig. 8) is data from a register associated with an encoded address (i.e. the combination of register address and the mode bits, 17 in Fig. 8) obtained from the received inputs (e.g. see Fig. 8).

As per claim 8, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that data is outputted from the unbanked memory unit (i.e. the stackable memory area) for at least two instructions, i.e. two different READ requests/instructions (e.g. see claim 15).

As per claim 9, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that inputs (i.e. the input from the read buffer 8 and the input from the internal bus 4 in Figs. 1 and 8) are received associated with at least one register (i.e. "reg add" in Fig. 8) and processor mode (i.e. "mode bits" in Fig. 8), and wherein one of the inputs is data to be written in a register associated with an encoded address (i.e. the combination of register address and the mode bits, 17 in Fig. 8) obtained from the received inputs (e.g. see Fig. 8).

As per claim 10, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that data for at least two retired instructions (i.e. WB 660 in Fig. 6) is to be written in at least two registers (i.e. via bus 426 in Fig. 6) (e.g. see Fig. 6 and paragraphs [0038]-[0040]).

As per claims 51, 61, 64, 74 and 78, see argument with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claims 51, 61, 64, 74 and 78 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1.

As per claims 14-23, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1-10, respectively. Claims 14-23 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 1-10, respectively.

As per claims 52-56, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 2-6, respectively. Claims 52-56 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 2-6, respectively.

As per claim 60, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that the processor is at least one of an embedded processor and a microprocessor (i.e. 62 in Fig. 8).

As per claims 62-63 and 67-69, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 2-6, respectively. Claims 62-63 and 67-69 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 2-6, respectively.

As per claims 65-66, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 2-3, respectively. Claims 65-66 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 2-3, respectively.

As per claim 73, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 60. Claim 73 is also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 60.

As per claims 75-77 and 79, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 8-10 and 8, respectively. Claims 75-77 and 79 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 8-10 and 8, respectively.

6.   Claims 1-10, 14-23 and 51-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jaggar.

As per claim 1, Jaggar teaches a register file for a data processing system comprising a unbanked memory unit (i.e. the stack memory area) having a plurality of memory locations, each memory location being addressable by an encoded address (i.e. the combination of register address and the mode bits, 17 in Figs. 1 and 8), wherein the encoded address corresponds to at least one register (i.e. registers R0-R13 in Figs.

1 and 8) and processor mode (i.e. a user mode and system mode); input ports (i.e. the input from the read buffer 8 and the input from the internal bus 4 in Figs. 1 and 8) to receive inputs for addressing at least one of the memory locations using an encoded address; and output ports (i.e. the output to write buffer 10 and the output to the internal bus 4 in Figs. 1 and 8) to output data from at least one of the memory locations addressable by an encoded address (e.g. see the abstract and Figs. 1 and 8).

Although Jaggar further teaches an (common) address encoder (i.e. the combination of components 12-20 in Fig. 8) for all input ports, the address encoder to provide an encoded address (i.e. the combination of register address and the mode bits, 17 in Fig. 8) for accessing one of the plurality of registers (i.e. R0-R15 in Fig. 8), Jaggar does not teach about having a plurality of encoders, a respective one of them for each of the input ports as claimed. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the current invention was made to come up to the claimed invention simply by duplicating the common address encoder taught by the Jaggar at both input ports. Mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless new and unexpected result is produced. See In re HARZA, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). In doing so, it increases the overall performance of the data processing system by providing the encoded addresses for all inputs in parallel compared to one by one. Therefore, it is being advantageous.

As per claim 2, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that a plurality of registers (i.e. registers R0-R13 in Figs. 1 and 8) correspond to the plurality of memory locations of the unbanked memory unit, i.e.

each register corresponds to one or more memory locations depending on the

processor mode (e.g. see the abstract).

As per claim 3, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and

furthermore, Jaggar teaches that each register (i.e. registers R0-R13 in Figs. 1 and 8) is

addressable by a corresponding encoded address (i.e. the combination of register

address and the mode bits, 17 in Figs. 1 and 8) (e.g. see the abstract and Figs. 1 and

8).

As per claim 4, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and

furthermore, Jaggar teaches that at least two registers are capable of being accessed in

different processor modes using the same encoded address, i.e. the system mode re-

uses the same set of registers as the user mode (e.g. see the abstract).

As per claim 5, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and

furthermore, Jaggar teaches that the read and write requests need to be redirected

whenever the mode is changed, therefore, the plurality of memory locations of the stack

memory are discontinuous (e.g. see Col. 6, lines 51-61).

As per claim 6, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and

furthermore, Jaggar teaches that a bit width of the plurality of memory locations (i.e. the

stackable memory area) is scalable to any arbitrary bit width size (e.g. see Col. 6, lines

51-61).

As per claim 7, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and

furthermore, Jaggar teaches that inputs (i.e. the input from the read buffer 8 and the

input from the internal bus 4 in Figs. 1 and 8) are received associated with at least one

register (i.e. "reg add" in Fig. 8) and processor mode (i.e. "mode bits" in Fig. 8), and

wherein at least one of the outputs (i.e. output in Fig. 8) is data from a register

associated with an encoded address (i.e. the combination of register address and the

mode bits, 17 in Fig. 8) obtained from the received inputs (e.g. see Fig. 8).

As per claim 8, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and

furthermore, Jaggar teaches that data is outputted from the unbanked memory unit (i.e.

the stackable memory area) for at least two instructions, i.e. two different READ

requests/instructions (e.g. see claim 15).

As per claim 9, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and

furthermore, Jaggar teaches that inputs (i.e. the input from the read buffer 8 and the

input from the internal bus 4 in Figs. 1 and 8) are received associated with at least one

register (i.e. "reg add" in Fig. 8) and processor mode (i.e. "mode bits" in Fig. 8), and

wherein one of the inputs is data to be written in a register associated with an encoded

address (i.e. the combination of register address and the mode bits, 17 in Fig. 8)

obtained from the received inputs (e.g. see Fig. 8).

As per claim 10, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and

furthermore, Jaggar teaches that data for at least two retired instructions (i.e. WB 660 in

Fig. 6) is to be written in at least two registers (i.e. via bus 426 in Fig. 6) (e.g. see Fig. 6

and paragraphs [0038]-[0040]).

As per claims 51, 61, 64, 74 and 78, see argument with respect to the rejection of

claim 1. Claims 51, 61, 64, 74 and 78 are also rejected based on the same rationale as

the rejection of claim 1.

As per claims 14-23, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1-10, respectively. Claims 14-23 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 1-10, respectively.

As per claims 52-56, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 2-6, respectively. Claims 52-56 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 2-6, respectively.

As per claim 57, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that each address encoder (i.e. the combination of components 12-20 in Fig. 8) includes input ports (i.e. the input from the read buffer 8 and the input from the internal bus 4 in Figs. 1 and 8) to receive inputs associated with at least one register (i.e. "reg add" in Fig. 8) and processor mode (i.e. "mode bits" in Fig. 8) in providing a corresponding encoded address (e.g. see Fig. 8). Jaggar also teaches that the (common) address encoder includes input ports to receive inputs associated with at least one register (i.e. "reg add" in Fig. 8) and processor mode (i.e. "mode bits" in Fig. 8) in providing a corresponding encoded address (e.g. see Fig. 8).

As per claim 58, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar teaches that the (common) address encoder includes logic circuitry (i.e. (i.e. the combination of components 12-20 in Fig. 8) to obtain the corresponding encoded address based on the received inputs (e.g. see Fig. 8).

As per claim 59, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Jaggar disclose that the logic circuitry includes at least one of a

programmable gate array (PGA) or a field programmable gate array (FPGA) (i.e. 20 in
Fig. 8).

As per claim 60, Jaggar teaches the claimed invention as described above and
furthermore, Jaggar teaches that the processor is at least one of an embedded
processor and a microprocessor (i.e. 62 in Fig. 8).

As per claims 62-63 and 67-69, see arguments with respect to the rejection of
claims 2-6, respectively. Claims 62-63 and 67-69 are also rejected based on the same
rationale as the rejection of claims 2-6, respectively.

As per claims 65-66, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 2-3,
respectively. Claims 65-66 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the
rejection of claims 2-3, respectively.

As per claims 70-73, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 57-60,
respectively. Claims 70-73 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the
rejection of claims 57-60, respectively.

As per claims 75-77 and 79, see arguments with respect to the rejection of
claims 8-10 and 8, respectively. Claims 75-77 and 79 are also rejected based on the
same rationale as the rejection of claims 8-10 and 8, respectively.

7.   Claims 12-13 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Jaggar in view Miller, further in view of Meier et al. (USPN:
6,363,471) hereinafter, Meier.

8.   Claims 12-13 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Jaggar in view Meier.

        As per claims 12 and 13, the combination of Jaggar and Miller teaches the

claimed invention as described above, but both Jaggar alone or in combination with

Miller failed to teach a latch circuit and a selector as clamed. Meier, however, teaches

about using the latch or other clocked storage devices to store the intermediate values

for pipelining to the next stage (e.g. see Col. 16, lines 21-35 and Fig. 6). Accordingly, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the current

invention was made to implement Meier's latch circuit in the register file taught by the

combination of Jaggar and Miller. In doing so, this latch circuit can buffer the data (i.e.

the encoded addresses) for pipeline storage in case if the data can be reused. The

further limitation of having the selector coupled to the latch and the address encoder is

well-known and notorious old in the art at the time of the current invention was made.

By using the selector, such as a mux, the encoded address can be selected either from

the latch circuit or directly from the address encoder based on a select signal. The

common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art

because applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice made in

the previous Office Action (see MPEP 2144.03 (C)).

        As per claims 25-26, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 12-13,

respectively. Claims 25-26 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the

rejection of claims 12-13, respectively.

9.   Applicant's amendment filed on April 10, 2007 necessitated the new ground(s) of

rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set

forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to HETUL PATEL whose telephone number is (571)272-

4184. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tuan V. Thai/   /Hetul Patel/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2186   Patent Examiner
                                                                   Art Unit 2186